

A HELLENISTIC LIST OF NAMES IN THE BODRUM MUSEUM: THE PTOLEMAIC GARRISON AT HALIKARNASSOS OR AN ERRANT LIST OF PROXENOI?

By Signe Isager

Summary: This is the publication of a fragmentary list of men inscribed on a reused marble block now in the Bodrum Museum (inv. no. 6665; *I. Halik.* *291). From the letterforms a date in the first part of the 3rd century BC is suggested. Assessing the type of the inscription proves difficult. The varying letterforms, the ethnics of the men, and the syntax lead one to consider a list of proxenoi. But, if that is correct, the text could not then originate from Halikarnassos, since it mentions one Halikarnasseus (a man who by definition could not obtain proxeny in his own city). Alternatively, the ethnics could reflect the composition of a group of mercenaries, perhaps as part of the Ptolemaic garrison stationed in Halikarnassos. The character of the fragmentary list remains open to interpretation.

Introduction

The inscription published here for the first time presents a riddle in several ways. Its finding place is listed as Bodrum and it is kept in Bodrum Museum (inv. no. 6665. *I. Halik.* *291. Fig. 1).¹ It is obviously part of a list

- 1 This article forms part of the prolegomena to a corpus of the inscriptions of Halikarnassos, in preparation by Jan-Mathieu Carbon, Poul Pedersen and me, and reflects our teamwork. (References to the corpus included here with a provisional numbering that follows the inventory of McCabe, Packard Humanities Institute, like for the present inscription *I. Halik.* *291; NB these numbers are liable to change) We owe sincere gratitude to the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums in Ankara for its generous permission concerning the work of the Danish Halikarnassos Project and are deeply grateful to the directorate and the staff of Bodrum Museum for their unfailing help and support.

of men. The list was inscribed by multiple hands. The support was reworked for secondary use and what is left of the inscription is a neat, rectangular and narrow cut, from the middle of the list – or possibly from one of several columns of a larger list. Luckily the extant vertical band reveals most of the ethnics of the listed men; their names or father's names are more seldom or more partially preserved. Among the entries, a group of Rhodians stand out due to their number, letterforms, and syntax.

This contribution is a presentation of the inscription and an attempt to date it, mainly from the letterforms. Finally, it offers a first discussion of the text's character and historical context. Definite answers have not yet been found but one can be confident that a publication in the present context will further the discussion. On a personal level, I am grateful for this opportunity to present the riddle to the honorand, as a token of my respect and friendship.

The Support

The stone is a large block of medium grained, white marble with bluish-grey areas.² The left part of the underside is broken but the right side of the block is preserved up to its full height of ca. 97 cm. The largest preserved width measured on the upper surface is 35.5 cm. The thickness of the block is 22.3–22.7 cm in its present state.

The block can be presumed to have originally had a rectangular shape. It was later reworked for secondary use as a double half-column for a window or a balustrade in a church or in a similar context. The top of the block and the central part of the front have clear remains of the original surface. The top surface has extensive toolmarks from a pointed chisel. About half of the underside is broken off and the remaining part is irregularly worn, with some traces from a pointed chisel or a pickaxe, presumably from being reworked for secondary use. The upper surface has a square dowel-hole (2x3.2 cm and 3.7 cm deep) showing that the block in its original context formed part of an architectural structure of some sort, perhaps the facing side of an ante (Fig. 2). The carefully cut dowel-

2 Poul Pedersen made the description of the support.

hole points to a late Classical or Hellenistic date. If the dowel-hole was originally placed midway in relation to the width of the block, it can be estimated that the block originally measured ca. 44.1 cm in width.

When reworked into a double half-column, the stone received a slightly projecting horizontal band about 5.5-6 cm in width along its upper side and ca. 6.5-7 cm in width along its underside. The upper and the lower bands are connected by a 10.5-11 cm wide band running down the middle of the front. This original part of the front bears the remains of an inscription. The front was smoothed before being inscribed but shows no clear tool marks. The secondary reworking to the left and right of the inscribed band was done with both a point and a rough toothed chisel.

A raised band about 12.5-13 cm in width is also found on the back of the stone. The back of the stone appears to consist of an entirely reworked surface and therefore the original thickness of the stone may have been larger than at present.

Surface and Layout

The surface bearing the inscription is smoothed, as stated above, but it also has some special features that must be kept in mind in relation to layout, letterforms and interpretation of the text. The upper horizontal band forms in the middle part of the original surface of the front of the block but due to the damage from the process of preparation for its secondary use, lines 1-4 were nearly obliterated. The original level of the surface continues in the first part of the vertical band running down the middle of the front, carrying lines 5-17. This part appears carefully smoothed, but not quite even, possibly as a consequence of the cautious erasure of an earlier inscription by grinding and polishing. There are scarce, faint traces of letters that do not belong to the main inscription and some letters in the margin. After the first 17 lines of the inscription, the face is cut back and continues at a slightly lower level. It is likely that an inscription was removed by that action and that lines 18-38 replaced it. The break and the start at a new level coincide with a shift in lettering.

Letterforms – dating

An approximative dating of the inscription can only be attempted from letterforms. This is difficult in the best cases and here there is an added difficulty in being confronted by multiple hands – different in style though probably closely contemporary. Conservatively, estimates of the dating range from the end of the 4th to early 2nd century BC.

As a base for the dating and interpretation from letterforms, two larger sections of the inscription – each undoubtedly cut in a single hand – will be described in detail. One is from the original level (lines 8-16) and one from the cut back, lower level (lines 22-37), which we a priori assume must be the later. The other lines will be described summarily and as need be for a possible interpretation.

Hand of lines 8-16

These lines were cut in an easy hand and with ample space between letters. The ends of the letters have tiny or no serifs. Height of delta, line 9: ca. 1 cm. While it is interesting that each short line ends with the same word (Ῥοδίωι) this also leads to the absence of potentially characteristic letters like ΕΘΞΠΨ that might have facilitated the dating.

Alpha: The crossbar is straight or slightly bowed.

Nu: The right vertical ends just above the baseline.

Omicron: The letter varies in size and position and is often larger than the omega.

Rho: The characteristic letter has a loop of moderate size that ends obliquely, slightly more than halfway down the vertical.

Sigma: Only one occurs. Its lower bar is horizontal while the upper diverges slightly upwards.

Phi: Only one occurs in the main text. Its body is of moderate size, and nearly circular, its lower part slightly less rounded. (The margin of lines 14 and 15 might each have a small phi with a torpedo-formed body).

Omega: The characteristic omega is short and generally rests on the baseline, a combination which might point to a later date, but which does already occur, albeit not as a general trait, in some of the early inscriptions from Halikarnassos (e.g. *I. Halik.* *1 (5th century BC, 2. quarter); *312

(394/3-382/1?)³, and *17 (279/8 or shortly after). The rounded part is quite open at the bottom where it ends in short or moderate horizontal strokes without serifs or with slightly thickened ends.

The lines above the section 8-16.

The letters of lines 1-4 are nearly obliterated. They appear smaller than those below (epsilon line 2: 0.6 cm). It seems that xi (line 3) is three-barred, like certainly in line 21. Lines 5-7: The phi of line 6 has a broad and slender body, quite unlike the one in line 13. Line 7 was cut more deeply than the others, probably either to correct a cutter's error or to reuse some parts from an earlier inscription. Apart from that the letters of line 7 look much like those of the section 8-16 and it is not possible to decide, if lines 1-7 are of the same hand as the section 8-16, but it seems unlikely that at least lines 1-4 belong to the same batch as lines 8-16.

Hand of lines 22-37

Lines 22-37 were cut in one, firm hand, and clearly differ in style from the section 8-16. Generally, the letters are broad and solid with mostly moderate serifs. Height of lambda in line 26: ca. 1.3 cm.

Alpha: The crossbar is straight.

Epsilon: The middle horizontal is short, the outer ones rather long (like occasionally in *22).

Kappa: The lower oblique does not reach the baseline.

Mu: the outer bars diverge, the v is not deep. Once, in line 25, the right outer bar ends in a slightly downwards-pointing stroke which connects it to the following letter.

Nu: The second vertical of the generally broadish letter does not touch the baseline.

Xi: The letter is four-barred, the central horizontal closer to the upper one and slightly shorter than the other two (like in *312, above note 3).

Omicron: The letter varies considerably in size.

Rho: The size of the loop varies from moderate to very large (line 28).

Sigma: The outer bars diverge and have emphatic serifs, or they are nearly parallel.

Upsilon: The branches open widely and curve.

Omega: The letter has the same height or is slightly shorter than the other letters, and moderately open at the bottom where it ends in long horizontal strokes (cf. *22).

The lines between the two sections and the last line (17-22 right, and 38)

Line 17, the last line at the original level of the surface, is cramped in terms of space and its two final letters look rather unlike the rest, maybe recut. Line 18 is the first line we read at the new level (2-3 mm deeper than the level above). The line has more space, high letters (pi: 1.4 cm) and it was cut much more deeply than the letters of the other lines. Pi: The right vertical is straight and short. Sigma: the upper outer bar diverges from the horizontal lower one. Theta: The letter has a dot at its centre. Omega: Its rounded part is rather large. Line 19 has smaller letters, but nu and rho point to the style of section 22-37. Lines 20, 21, and the right half of line 22 are smaller still, more like lines 1-4. Xi in 21 is three-barred, like probably in line 3 (but not in 23). Line 38: A small epsilon is followed by a few letters, that are larger, but lower than in 22-37. It is not possible to decide about the hand.

To conclude on letterforms, no obvious parallel especially to the second section (22-37) is known to us from Halikarnassos, but there is no other comparable list that has come to light there until now. In its firm character the lower section rather compares to the treaty between Latmos and Pidasa, dated as early as 323-313/2 BC. Among Halikarnassian inscriptions, both sections have features in common with *312; *17; *121; *22, which could mean a date in the early part of the 3rd century BC. It seems logical to assume that the upper part (with lines 8-16) was generally entered before the lower one (with lines 23-37), not least because of the difference in level. But this is not necessarily the case. The surface of the upper part bears scarce traces of an earlier inscription. Several lines differ from the two sections in size, being in smaller, elegant letters and by having a three barred xi, e.g. 20, 21, and the right half of 22.⁴ The entire inscription may be dated to the first half of the 3rd century BC, but the margin of error allowed by the letterforms as well as the inherently composite and complex character of the text is wide.

4 It cannot be excluded that a vertical was added to the small xi in painting only.

IHalikarnassos *291

Based on autopsy, photos, and a squeeze

- — — — —
 [— — — —] *uncertain traces* [— —]
 [— — — —] Ἀλεξανδρ[— — —]
 [— — — —] δρεὺς Ἀλεξανδρ[— — —]
 [— — — —] Π]οσειδ[— —]/ΛΥ\ [— —]
 5 [— — — ?Καλ]ύμνιος [— —]
 [— — — —] Ἀμφικλῆς Κ[— —]
 [— — — —] στου Ἀκαρν[άν —]
 [— — — —] ου Ῥοδίωι νν [— —]
 [— — — —] ρίδα Ῥοδίωι [— —]
 10 [— — — —] ς Ῥοδίωι ννν [— —]
 [— — — —] Ῥ]οδίωι νννν [— —]
 [— — — —] νου Ῥοδίωι [— —]
 [— — — —] φάντου Ῥο[δίωι — —]
 [— — — —] Ῥοδίωι νννν \Φ/[— —]
 15 [— — — —] α Ῥοδίωι νν \Φ/[— —]
 [— — — —] ου Ῥοδίωι [— —]
 [— — — —] Κ]νώσιος [— —]
 [— — — —] ς Πυθίω[νος — —]
 [— — — —] νους Κυρη[ναῖος — —]
 20 [— — — —] Σωπάτρο[υ — —]
 [— — — —] Ἀλεξανδρ[— — —]
 [— — — —] . Κρής Νεο[— —]
 [— — — —] Ἀ]λεξανδρ[— — —]
 [— — — —] ωνίδου Ῥό[διος — —]
 25 [— — — —] Ε]ὺρωμεύ[ς — —]
 [— — — —] -ο]υ Ἀλικαρ[νασσεύς — —]
 [— — — —] νου Κρή[ς — —]
 [— — — —] Σ]αρδιανό[ς — —]
 [— — — —] ς ν Ἐρινα[εύς — —]
 30 [— — — —] ς Ἐριναε[ύς — —]
 [— — — —] Δημη]τρίου Ἐριν[αεύς — —]
 [— — — —] ου Ἐρινα[εύς — —]
 [— — — —] ν Ἐριναεύ[ς — —]

35 [— — — — — Ἰ]δύμιος [— — —]
[— — — — — Ἰδ]ύμιος v [— — —]
[— — — — —]νου Κα[— — —]
[— — — — — Ἀσ]πένδ[ι]ος
[— — — — —]\E/ . ΟΡΥ[— — — — —]

Line by line commentary

To the right of lines 4 and 5 there are traces of letters that do not seem to follow the pattern of the lines to the left. These may be additions, cut between lines or in empty space to the right. They might also be traces of earlier inscription(s).

Line 3: Ἀλεξαῖνδρεὺς Ἀλεξαν[δρεὺς? But it would be odd to have twice the ethnic.

Line 4: Π]οσειδε[ίου possibly.

ΛY falls to the right, in the interlinear space. Possibly part of $[\text{K}\alpha]\lambda\acute{\upsilon}[\mu\nu\text{ios}]$.

Line 5: ?Καλ]ύμνιος: The squeeze seems to corroborate the reading of a final sigma. Alternatively Τ]ύμνιος?

Line 6: The final kappa is very uncertain.

Line 7: The line appears deeply cut, probably because it was cut over an earlier inscription. Kappa appears cut over an earlier eta. It is followed by an alpha and what looks like a lambda with possibly a loop added to the left oblique to make it a (stooping) rho. From the foot of the right oblique raises a vertical (an iota or left vertical of nu or mu?) from the top of which is seen what might be the upper part of an oblique for a nu or mu. But it is rather bowed and might not form part of the line under discussion. We expect an ethnic in this position and the reading Ἀκαρῶ[άν] is supported by the squeeze which doesn't show the right oblique of the lambda. Alternative: Ἀκαλι[σσεύς]? But there is to our knowledge no (other?) Greek evidence for this community until the centuries AD. If this line is more deeply cut because it is special and the final word a personal name (patronym) and not an ethnic (cf. on line 18) there seems to be one possibility, Ἀκαρῶ[ομέλ-]

δωνος. The name Akarmomeldon is only attested in a dedicatory inscription from Halikarnassos.⁵

Line 9: Names ending in -ρίδας are common in Rhodes.

Lines 14 and 15: In the “vacat” to the right, but not in line with the preceding letters, what looks like a smaller phi.

Line 18: The first letter, sigma, probably ends a name in the nominative case.

Line 22: Νέο- in smaller letters might not belong to the foregoing Κρής but to an additional entry.

Line 36: After the final alpha, there might be a sigma, lambda or delta. Κα[λυνδεύς or Κα[λλιπολίτης, would be two possibilities, both Karian ethnics.

Line 38: Below the epsilon of line 37 a small raised epsilon. In larger letters: ΟΡΥ, possibly part of a personal name.

The character of the list

The heading of the inscription, if any, is lost. Maybe it was cut into the superposed building block. It might have been quite short, e.g. the mention of an eponym, as is seen in a likewise enigmatic list from Athens (391/0 BC).⁶ With no further details available, the character of the truncated list is thus open for discussion. What is preserved is part of a list of men, generally entered with patronym and city ethnic. In most cases only the ethnic is preserved or nearly so. The analysis of letterforms demonstrates that the names were entered by different cutters, probably on different occasions. The letterforms in all entries allow for a date at the very end of the fourth or in the first half of the third century BC: ca. 300-250 BC. At any rate, a terminus ante quem of ca. 220 BC appears to be provided by the ethnics Kalymnios and Euromeus (see below).

Most names were entered in batches and some perhaps individually. This is confirmed by the syntax: at least nine Rhodians were, to judge from the letterforms (section of upper level), entered contemporaneously and by one letter cutter. They were perhaps the only individuals

5 Benndorf & Niemann 1884, 11, no. 2.

6 Ed.pr. Themis 2009 (SEG 59:99, where it is classified as an honorific decree).

that were entered in the dative case. Where it is possible to verify, the other names were in the nominative case. Nonetheless, we must assume some form of unity in the document since there is no extra space between any of the lines to mark a new beginning. The dative case of the Rhodians places them in the position of receivers or more specifically honorands. The names in the nominative must follow suit. At least two types of lists would qualify for the above description: a list of proxenoi (or new citizens), or a list of mercenaries. These are often the alternatives discussed when a headless list of men is discovered.⁷ An analysis of the provenance of the persons who received some sort of honour must first be attempted.

The home-city of the men listed

The men listed were predominantly from southwestern Asia Minor (Euromos: 1, Erinaeis: 5, Halikarnassos: 1, Idyma: 2, perhaps Ka[lynda? or Ka[lilpolis?: 1, Aspendos: 1, Sardis: 1 – being the northernmost city (but by the way clearly considered a Greek polis by ca. 330-300 BC). They also come from the major islands along the coast (Rhodes: 9-10, Kalymna: 1-3), but also from further abroad: Krete (3; Knossos is once specified), Egypt (Alexandria: probably 4),⁸ and Libya (Kyrene: 1). One might be from Akarnania.

The home city of the Erinaeis on our list seems likely to be identical with that of the unlocated Ἐρινεῖς who contributed to the Delian League in the fifth century and were registered in the Karian district.⁹ It was

7 E.g., *I. Tralleis und Nysa* 33, reassessed by L. Robert as a list of mercenaries, not proxenoi: cf. Wörrle 2015: 293, Mack 2015: 287 with note 5 ad *I. Tralles* 33. See also a recently published proxeny-list from Phigaleia, Themom & Zavvou 2019.

8 Lines 2; 3; 21; 23. None of the words are completely preserved. That they are ethnics and not personal names is an educated guess.

9 Theoretically, the Erinaeis could be members of the Rhodian deme of that name which according to Christian Thomsen was most likely located on the island of Rhodes. But it is unlikely that the five individuals would appear under their Rhodian deme-name and not as “Rhodians”, amongst other persons listed by their city ethnics, including at least 9 persons called Rhodians. (Christian Thomsen kindly shared his thoughts on the Erinaeis with me by e-mail of 24.09.2015)

very probably citizens from that city, the ἑπειναίεις, who assisted the citizens of Theangela, when they were threatened by the dynast Eupolemos. Theangela finally surrendered and an inscription containing the treaty concluded between Theangela and its mercenaries on the one hand, and Eupolemos on the other is extant, except for its heading. The first complete sentence preserved is: “there shall be amnesty for the Ereinaieis as well.” It was Louis Robert who first suggested that these Ereinaieis were from a small city in the vicinity of Theangela. The precise dating of the treaty is debated, but if we follow Roberta Fabiani it probably belongs in the first two decades of the 3rd century BC.¹⁰

Kalymna was incorporated as a deme of the Koan state sometime in the decade 220-210 BC (cf. IG XII,4 152 with comm.). Euromos was renamed Philippi during a period of Antigonid rule starting in ca. 221/0 BC or somewhat earlier. These data gleaned from the text also support a date before this time, more probably ca. 300-250 BC. Idyma, mentioned in lines 34-35, became a koinon rather than a polis as a part of its integration in the Rhodian Peraia. Unfortunately, the date for this political change remains unknown but is likely to be anterior to ca. 225 BC).¹¹

The reason for listing the men

While we must presume that the men on the list were all granted a specific honour or privilege and that it was the same for all of them, it is not necessary, or even probable – considering the difference in lettering and thereby most likely in time –, that the motivations and especially the circumstances for their receiving this honour or privilege were the same. The nine Rhodians in the dative case could at some point have served as a part of an embassy, a board of judges, negotiators, or arbitrators.¹² The

10 Fabiani 2009. Incidentally, the letterforms of the treaty have much in common with those of a newly published honorific decree from Halikarnassos, *312 (294-281), Carbon, Isager & Pedersen 2021.

11 Wiemer 2010: 420 and 425.

12 Incidentally, we know that a similar group of nine Rhodians served as ambassadors and judges at Delphi, for which they were granted the status of proxenoi (180/79), Mack 2015: Appendix: 5. Delphi, 304-307 with note 26.

Rhodians could of course also have been present in Halikarnassos for other reasons, e.g. in a military capacity.

List of proxenoi?

What is preserved has all the characteristics of a proxeny list.¹³ All men seem listed by their own name, their father's name and their ethnic. The latter is in nearly all cases the city ethnic as expected in a proxeny list. One clear exception in the present list is Kretan (Κρής), a regional ethnic occurring twice (line 22; line 27), while another person is entered with the city ethnic Knossian (Κνώσιος). There are parallels for this e.g. from Epidauros in proxeny-lists of the period ca. 260-240 BC where the city ethnic Knossian (Κνώσιος) also occurs, while another person, entered as proxenos in the period ca. 220-200 BC, was designated with both his ethnics, as Κρής Κνώσιος.¹⁴ The city ethnic Rhodios in the dative occurs to our knowledge in no other connection than the honour of proxeny and/or citizenship.

The fact that the names on the list were entered at different occasions, some in batches, some individually, would also match a proxeny list. When the Rhodians were entered, the heading would have included or implied a formulation like: "... proxenia was given to ..."¹⁵ The first line at the new level on the stone (18) differs from the rest by being in larger letters, more deeply cut, and by having more space. It might be an individual entry, but Pythion (or NN son of Pythion) might also be an eponym.¹⁶ This line could have laconically stated: Proxenoι under (?xx son of) Pythion and been followed by the proxenoι in the nominative case.

The entries in smaller letters – including perhaps several Alexandrians¹⁷ – might (but need not) have been added later where space was available. Such additions are also a well-known feature in proxeny lists.

13 For these characteristics see Mack 2015.

14 Mack 2015: Appendix: 6, Epidauros.

15 Cf. the earliest proxeny list of the Aitolians, Mack 2015: Appendix: 1.

16 In Aitolia, the entries were often dated by the strategos.

17 See above note 9.

As noted above, traces of letters to the right of the extant column might also be from such additions.¹⁸

The man from Halikarnassos

There is at least one major obstacle to assuming that this is a proxeny list from Halikarnassos itself: among the men listed is a person with the ethnic Halikarnassian (line 26). The entry is probably of the same kind as the rest – but a city could not nominate its own citizen as proxenos. The Halikarnassian's presence might be explained if he were entered as the guarantor (ἔγγυος) of the proxenos mentioned in the line above.¹⁹ But it would be strange if only one proxenos were to have such a guarantor in our list. If the list forms part of a list of proxenoi or new citizens it should be considered a *pierre errante* or a misattribution among the many non-Halikarnassian stones of the Bodrum Museum.

Members of a garrison?

The presence of a Halikarnassian in the list would, at first sight at least, not present a problem if what we have is a list of mercenaries. In fact, the provenance of the persons on our list could reflect the diverse, even fluctuating, composition of a garrison stationed in Halikarnassos. Evidence for the presence of a Ptolemaic garrison comes from Athens, in the well-known honorific decree for the Athenian Kallias of Sphettos, which was passed in 270/69 BC for his services to the Athenians.²⁰ In the long enumeration of his merits, it is said that Kallias continued to assist his home-city in diplomatic matters having to do with the Ptolemies, while being stationed in Halikarnassos as commander of a garrison of mercenaries. From this Athenian decree we thus know of the Ptolemaic garrison in

18 Cf. Mack 2015: Appendix: 4.2 A with Fig. A. 14., a supplementary catalogue of proxenoi from Chios (early third century BC).

19 Aitolian lists have, except for the oldest, the new proxenos in the dative, followed by his *egguos* in the nominative. Mack 2015: Appendix: 1.

20 IG II³ 911.

Halikarnassos in the year 270/69; this provides only a *terminus ante quem* for its arrival, which is more probably situated in ca. 280 BC or shortly thereafter.²¹

A mercenary from Halikarnassos might be stationed in his hometown, as a recently published inscription from Lykian Limyra shows.²² The inscription is broken at the top, but some of the heading is preserved and below it 18 men are listed by name, patronym and ethnic. Whenever there is more than one man from the same city or region, they are grouped together, but each has his own full entry, including the ethnic. There are slightly more city ethnics than regional ones.²³ The men listed are members of a Ptolemaic garrison, among them two citizen of Limyra, the city where the garrison was placed. The differences with our inscription are not insignificant, however: the inscription from Limyra was made on one occasion; it is one cutter's work. The 18 men listed (all in the nominative case) were members of the association of Basilistai and made a common dedication. If the list at the Bodrum Museum is a list of mercenaries from Halikarnassos its varied form remains a riddle.

Concluding remarks

The unifying element in the list of men dating to probably the first half of the third century BC seems to be that all men listed received an official honour. While the honour will have been of the same kind for all, the reason for bestowing it may have varied.

The combination of ethnics in the list would agree with either a non-Halikarnassian list of proxenoi or a Halikarnassian list of mercenaries. The variation in letterforms as well as the shift in syntax seem to bear witness to the names having been entered in batches and on different

21 For the political relations of Halikarnassos in the early 3rd century BC cf. now Carbon and Isager 2021; Carbon, Isager & Pedersen 2021.

22 Wörrle 2015: SEG 65:1469, ca. 250–200 BC. See also SEG 60:1536 (ca. 250 BC, possibly 277/76, Wörrle 2010. Incidentally, Kallias is known to have been a commander of the Ptolemaic garrison earlier in Limyra (ca. 300 BC): Wörrle 2019.

23 In parallel with the text from Bodrum, the list from Limyra includes two mercenaries from Aspendos, one from Kalymna and one from Kyrene.

occasions: this would fit especially a mainly chronological list of proxenoi. Nevertheless, mercenaries or members of the Ptolemaic garrison stationed in Halikarnassos cannot be excluded.

There are too many unknowns for us yet to reach a definitive conclusion on the type and context of the inscription.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck-Brandt, B., S. Ladstätter & B. Yener-Marksteiner (eds.) 2015. *Turm und Tor: Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und benachbarten Kulturlandschaften. Akten des Gedenkkolloquiums für Thomas Marksteiner in Wien, November 2012*. Vienna.
- Benndorf, O. & G. Niemann 1884. *Reisen in Lykien und Karien* I. Vienna.
- Blümel, W. 1997. 'Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasas' *EA* 29, 135-42.
- Blümel, W., R. van Bremen & J.-M. Carbon 2014. *A Guide to Inscriptions in Milas and its Museum*. Istanbul.
- Brun, P., L. Capdetrey & P. Fröhlich (eds.) 2021. *L'Asie Mineure au IIIe siècle*. Pessac.
- Carbon, J.-M. & S. Isager 2021. 'Early Ptolemaic Halikarnassos (ca. 280-260 BC) and its Network of Interactions' in Poulsen, Pedersen & Lund 2021, 109-24.
- Carbon, J.-M., S. Isager & P. Pedersen 2021. 'A Pair of Brothers in the Court of Antiochos I: A New Honorific Decree from Halikarnassos' in Brun, Capdetrey & Fröhlich 2021, 213-29.
- Carbon, J.-M. & R. van Bremen (eds.) 2010, *Hellenistic Karia*. Bordeaux.
- Chaniotis, A. 2002. 'Foreign Soldiers, Native girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons' in Chaniotis & Ducrey 2002, 99-113.
- Chaniotis, A. 2004: 'Mobility of persons during the Hellenistic wars' in Moatti 2004, 481-95.
- Chaniotis, A & P. Ducrey (eds.) 2002. *Army and Power in the Ancient World*. Stuttgart.
- Cook, J.M. 1961. 'Cnidian Peraea and Spartan coins' *JHS* 56-72.
- Crampa, J. 1969. *Labraunda, Swedish Excavations and Researches*. III, 1. *The Greek Inscriptions*. Part I: 1-12 (*ActaAth*-40, 5:3:1). Lund.

- Crampa, J. 1972. *Labraunda, Swedish Excavations and Researches*, III, 2. *The Greek Inscriptions*. Part II: 1–133 (ActaAth-40, 5:3:2). Stockholm.
- Errington, M. 1993. 'Inscriben von Euromos' EA 21, 15–32.
- Fabiani, R. 2009. 'Eupolemos Potalou o Eupolemos Simalou? Un nuovo documento da Iasos' EA 42, 61–77.
- Fabiani, R. 2014. 'Gli onori dei prosseni a Iasos' in Fischer 2014, 99–123.
- Fischer, J. (ed.) 2014. *Der Beitrag Kleinasien zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Antike: Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Wien, 3.-5. November 2010*. Vienna.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1992. 'Rhodioi in Hellenistic Rhodes' C&M 43, 43–69.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2000. 'The Rhodian Peraia in the third and second centuries BC' C&M 51, 129–83.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2011. 'The Chrysaoreis of Caria' in Karlsson & Carlsson 2011, 331–53.
- Gabrielsen, V., P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad & J. Zahle (eds.) 1999. *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization IX). Aarhus.
- Habicht, C. 2002. 'Die Ehren der Proxenoï. Ein Vergleich' MH 59, 13–30.
- Nielsen, T.H. 2004. *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 7* (Historia Einzelschriften 180). Stuttgart.
- HTC = Debord, P. & E. Varinlioğlu (eds.) 2001. *Les hautes terres de Carie*. Bordeaux.
- IACP = Hansen, M.H. & T.H. Nielsen (eds.) 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford.
- Karlsson, L. & S. Carlsson 2011. *Labraunda and Karia. Proceedings of an International Symposium Commemorating Sixty Years of Swedish Archaeological Work in Labraunda. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and Letters, History and Antiquity, Stockholm, November 20–21, 2008* (Boreas 32). Uppsala.
- Karlsson, L., S. Carlsson & J. B. Kullberg (eds.) 2014. *ΛΑΒΡΥΣ. Studies Presented to Pontus Hellström* (Boreas 35). Uppsala.
- Launey, M. 1987. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*. Paris.
- Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.

- Moatti, C. (ed.) 2004. *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*. Rome.
- Norena, C.F. & N. Papazarkadas 2019. *From Document to History: Epigraphic Insights into the Greco-Roman World*. Leiden.
- Paarman, B. 2004. 'Geographically Grouped Ethnics in the Athenian Tribute Lists' in Nielsen 2004, 77-85.
- Papachristodoulou, I. 1999. 'The Rhodian Demes' in Gabrielsen, Bilde, Engberg-Pedersen, Hannestad & Zahle 1999, 27-44.
- Poulsen, B., P. Pedersen & J. Lund (eds.) 2021. *Karia and the Dodekanese, Cultural Interrelations in the Southeast Aegean II, Early Hellenistic to Early Byzantine*. Oxford & Philadelphia.
- Reger, G. 1999. 'The relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC' in Gabrielsen, Bilde, Engberg-Pedersen, Hannestad & Zahle 1999, 76-97.
- Robert, L. 1936. *Collection Froehner. I, Inscriptions grecques*. Paris.
- Rizakis, A.D. 2008. *Achaïe III. Les Cités achéennes: Epigraphie et histoire* (Meletemata 55). Paris.
- Shear, T.L. 1978. *Kallias of Sphettos and the revolt of Athens in 286 BC* (Hesperia Supplement 17). Princeton, NJ.
- Themos, A. 2009. 'Αττική ἐπιγραφή τοῦ 391/0 π.Χ' in Themis & Papazarkadas 2009, 67-74.
- Themos, A. & N. Papazarkadas (eds.) 2009. *Ἀττικά Ἐπιγραφικά. Μελέτες πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Christian Habicht*. Athens.
- Themos, A. & E. Zavvou 2019. 'New Hellenistic Inscriptions from Phigaleia (Arcadia)' in Norena & Papazarkadas 2019, 103-19.
- Van Bremen, R. 2016. 'Olympichos and Mylasa: A New Inscription from the Temple of Zeus Osogō?' *EA* 49, 1-26.
- Wiemer, H.U. 2010. 'Structure and Development of the Rhodian Peraia: Evidence and Models' in Carbon & van Bremen 2010, 415-34.
- Wilhelm, A. 1908. 'Inchriften aus Halikarnassos und Theangela' *JÖAI* 11, 53-75.
- Wörle, M. 1988. 'Inchriften von Herakleia am Latmos I' *Chiron* 18, 421-76.

- Wörrle, M. 2010. 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens VIII. Ein ptolemäisches Prostagma aus Limyra über Mißstände beim Steuereinzug' *Chiron* 40, 359-94.
- Wörrle, M. 2015. 'Die ptolemäische Garnison auf der Burg von Limyra im Licht einer neuen Inschrift' in Beck-Brandt, Ladstätter & Yener-Marksteiner 2015, 291-303.
- Wörrle, M. 2019. 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XII: Schutz für Kallias. Ein rätselhaftes Fragment aus dem frühhellenistischen Limyra' *Chiron* 49, 161-71.
- Zgusta, L. 1984. *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*. Heidelberg.

FIGURES

Fig. 1 Inv. no. 6665. *I. Halik.* *291 (Danish Halikarnassos Project)



Fig. 2 Ibid.

